

Robust weak-lensing mass calibration of Planck galaxy clusters

Anja von der Linden^{1,2,3} $\star$, Adam Mantz^{4,5}, Steven W. Allen^{2,3,6}, Douglas E. Applegate⁷, Patrick L. Kelly⁸, R. Glenn Morris^{2,6}, Adam Wright^{2,3,6}, Mark T. Allen^{2,3}, Patricia R. Burchat^{2,3}, David L. Burke^{2,6}, David Donovan⁹, Harald Ebeling⁹

¹Dark Cosmology Centre, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen Juliane Maries Vej 30, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

²Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, 452 Lomita Mall, Stanford, CA 94305-4085, USA

³Department of Physics, Stanford University, 382 Via Pueblo Mall, Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

⁴Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637-1433, USA

⁵Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637-1433, USA

⁶SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, 2575 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA

⁷Argelander-Institut für Astronomie, Universität Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, 53121 Bonn, Germany

⁸Department of Astronomy, University of California, B-20 Hearst Field Annex # 3411, Berkeley, CA 94720-3411, USA

⁹Institute for Astronomy, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

ABSTRACT

In light of the tension in cosmological constraints reported by the *Planck* team between their SZ-selected cluster counts and Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature anisotropies, we compare the *Planck* cluster mass estimates with robust, weak-lensing mass measurements from the *Weighing the Giants* (WtG) project. For the 22 clusters in common between the *Planck* cosmology sample and WtG, we find an overall mass ratio of $\langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}} \rangle = 0.688 \pm 0.072$. Extending the sample to clusters not used in the *Planck* cosmology analysis yields a consistent value of $\langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}} \rangle = 0.698 \pm 0.062$ from 38 clusters in common. Identifying the weak-lensing masses as proxies for the true cluster mass (on average), these ratios are $\sim 1.6\sigma$ lower than the default bias factor of 0.8 assumed in the *Planck* cluster analysis. Adopting the WtG weak-lensing-based mass calibration would substantially reduce the tension found between the *Planck* cluster count cosmology results and those from CMB temperature anisotropies, thereby dispensing of the need for “new physics” such as uncomfortably large neutrino masses (in the context of the measured *Planck* temperature anisotropies and other data). We also find modest evidence (at 95 per cent confidence) for a mass dependence of the calibration ratio and discuss its potential origin in light of systematic uncertainties in the temperature calibration of the X-ray measurements used to calibrate the *Planck* cluster masses. Our results exemplify the critical role that robust absolute mass calibration plays in cluster cosmology, and the invaluable role of accurate weak-lensing mass measurements in this regard.

Key words: galaxies: clusters: general; gravitational lensing: weak; cosmology: observations

1 INTRODUCTION

The *Planck* satellite has recently provided new, precise cosmological constraints based on measurements of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature anisotropies (Planck Collaboration 2013a, hereafter P16), confirming that a spatially flat Λ CDM model provides an excellent description of the observable Universe. However, an uncomfortable result of the *Planck* team’s analysis is that for a spatially flat Λ CDM model, their cosmological constraints derived from the number density of galaxy clusters detected

with *Planck* through the Sunyaev-Zel’dovich (SZ) effect are in tension with the constraints from the CMB temperature power spectrum: in particular, the *Planck* cluster analysis (Planck Collaboration 2013b, hereafter P20) prefers a significantly lower value of the amplitude of the matter power spectrum at late times, σ_8 , compared to the value extrapolated from CMB temperature anisotropies.

The *Planck* team suggest two possible explanations for this tension. One is that the calibration of their cluster mass estimates, which are based on hydrostatic mass measurements derived from *XMM-Newton* X-ray observations, is biased low. An important aspect of that analysis is the assumed value of the mass bias, $\langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{true}} \rangle = (1 - b)$. Expecting some level of non-thermal

$\star$ E-mail: anja@slac.stanford.edu

pressure support to be present in even relatively relaxed clusters, they present two sets of results, one which sets $(1 - b) \equiv 0.8$, and one which marginalizes over the range $0.7 < (1 - b) < 1.0$.

Reconciling the observed tension between *Planck* SZ cluster counts and the CMB power spectrum would, however, require an even lower ratio. Alternatively, keeping the *Planck* mass calibration fixed at $(1 - b) = 0.8$, the *Planck* team argue that their CMB and SZ-cluster data could be explained by a species-summed neutrino mass of $\Sigma m_\nu = (0.58 \pm 0.20)$ eV (2.8σ significance departure from zero), a result that is in tension with the 95 per cent confidence upper limit of 0.23 eV derived from the *Planck* CMB analysis (P16) in combination with WMAP low-multipole polarization (Bennett et al. 2013), high-multipole temperature anisotropy from SPT and ACT (Reichardt et al. 2012; Das et al. 2014), and the 6df, SDSS and BOSS BAO surveys (Beutler et al. 2011; Padmanabhan et al. 2012; Anderson et al. 2012), and earlier studies using WMAP CMB data and independent X-ray and optical cluster measurements (Mantz et al. 2010b; Reid et al. 2010). Marginalizing over $0.7 < (1 - b) < 1.0$, the evidence for massive neutrinos is weakened but still present, $\Sigma m_\nu = (0.40 \pm 0.21)$ eV (1.9σ).

In this letter, we investigate the reliability of the *Planck* cluster mass measurements by comparing them with robust, independently derived weak-lensing mass measurements from the *Weighing the Giants* (WtG) project (von der Linden et al. 2014; Kelly et al. 2014; Applegate et al. 2014). As has been discussed in the literature, systematic uncertainty in the absolute calibration of cluster masses is currently the most significant challenge facing cluster cosmology (WtG; see also Vikhlinin et al. 2009; Mantz et al. 2010a; Rozo et al. 2010; Sehgal et al. 2011; Benson et al. 2013; Allen et al. 2011; LSST Dark Energy Science Collaboration 2012). Weak lensing provides our most promising method to calibrate the absolute masses of clusters since it measures the total mass directly, without relying on baryonic tracers, and is expected, from simulations, to be accurate (i.e. exhibit minimal bias in the mean). The WtG project targeted a subset of 51 clusters in catalogs based on the ROSAT All-Sky Survey (RASS, Truemper 1993). The overlap between those X-ray detected clusters and the *Planck* cluster catalog (see *Planck* Collaboration 2013c, hereafter P29) is substantial: 38 WtG clusters are also in the *Planck* cluster sample, 22 of which were used in the *Planck* cluster count cosmology analysis. The WtG masses hence provide an excellent external, independent dataset to assess the calibration of the *Planck* cluster masses.

The masses and mass ratios quoted in this paper assume a flat Λ CDM cosmological model with $\Omega_m = 0.3$ and $H_0 = 100 h$ km/s/Mpc, where $h = 0.7$.

2 DATA

We compare *Planck* and WtG measurements of M_{500} , i.e. the integrated mass inside the associated radius r_{500} , within which the average density is 500 times the critical density at the cluster redshift. We note that because the mass is defined as enclosing a given mean density (rather than a given physical radius), the impact of any systematic calibration uncertainty in these measurements is boosted in the comparison: if the masses are systematically underestimated, the r_{500} values are also underestimated, leading to even lower cluster mass estimates. Nevertheless, direct comparison of the M_{500} mass estimates is sensible, since these are the relevant quantities for the *Planck* cluster cosmology analysis. The *Planck* M_{500} estimates are listed in Table C.1 of P29.

2.1 Unbiased weak-lensing mass estimates from *Weighing the Giants*

A key assumption in the present analysis is that the WtG weak-lensing cluster mass estimates are unbiased *on average*. In von der Linden et al. (2014) and Applegate et al. (2014), we discuss potential residual sources of bias and quantify the uncertainties that they introduce. We provide a short summary here, and refer the reader to the WtG papers for more detailed explanations.

Weak lensing cluster mass estimates require three components: estimates of the distortion of each galaxy image due to the cluster (“shear”), estimates of the redshifts of the galaxies used in the weak lensing analysis (since the shear induced on a background galaxy depends on the ratio of angular diameter distances between the observer, cluster, and source), and an assumption regarding the mass distribution of the cluster.

We calibrate our shear estimates using the STEP 1 and 2 simulations (Heymans et al. 2006; Massey et al. 2007), which are ideally designed to calibrate shear measurements in Subaru images. Because the STEP simulations focus on relatively small shear values and non-crowded fields – assumptions which cannot be extended to cluster cores – we restrict the analysis to radii > 0.75 Mpc for the mass measurements.

In terms of the redshifts / redshift distribution of the galaxies in the cluster fields, we estimate cluster masses with two different methods in Applegate et al. (2014). The standard “color-cut” method (Hoekstra 2007; Okabe et al. 2010) which can be applied to observations in just two bands (or even a single band), implicitly places all galaxies at a single “effective” redshift, which is estimated by applying the same cuts in magnitude, colors, etc. to both the cluster field and to a reference deep field, with dilution due to cluster members not on the red sequence corrected using simple number density profiles. For the highest precision measurements, and especially at increasing cluster redshift, both the deep-field assumption and the cluster member correction are expected to break down due to cosmic variance, observational selection effects, etc. To overcome this limitation and provide improved robustness, we develop a maximum-likelihood method to measure weak-lensing cluster masses based on full photometric redshift probability distributions for individual galaxies. With extensive simulations we show that, when restricted to an optimal redshift range, this method yields nearly unbiased cluster mass measurements. Since not all WtG clusters have been imaged in sufficient bands to provide robust photometric redshift estimates, we use the subset of 27 clusters with full 5-filter photometry and masses determined with the improved method to calibrate traditional “color-cut” masses for the full sample of 51 clusters. In this way we obtain the largest overlap possible with the *Planck* analysis.

Finally, since lensing is sensitive to all matter along the line of sight and thus best at measuring projected (cylindrical) masses, some assumption about the cluster mass distribution needs to be made in order to infer a spherical overdensity mass such as M_{500} from the weak-lensing measurements. For our analysis, we fit a spherically symmetric NFW model to the observed shear profiles around cluster centroids determined from *Chandra* imaging in order to determine M_{500} . Since clusters are generally triaxial, have substructure, and other structures projected along the line of sight, we expect significant scatter in the relation between the “true” mass, and the mass inferred from lensing. From simulations, this intrinsic scatter is expected to be of the order of 20%; in ground-based observations such as those considered here, the shot noise in the shear estimates due to the intrinsic ellipticity of galaxies

adds a similar statistical scatter, yielding a total expected scatter of $\sim 30\%$ (Becker & Kravtsov 2011). Therefore, relatively large samples of clusters - selected in a way that does not depend on their lensing properties - are required to determine the mass calibration to high precision. The key question then becomes whether the *average* weak-lensing mass is unbiased. Fortunately, simulations indicate that for the most massive clusters, the average mass from an NFW fit is unbiased to within a few percent if the radial fit range is restricted to be within the virial radius (Becker & Kravtsov 2011; Bahé et al. 2012; Oguri & Hamana 2011; Giocoli et al. 2014). Given that the clusters considered here are among the most massive known, we fit our shear profiles over the range of 0.75–3 Mpc. The inner cut-off ensures that the quoted mass is largely insensitive to the choice of the concentration of the NFW profile: we assume $c = 4$, appropriate for the most massive clusters, and have verified that even substantial shifts in the assumed concentration cause only slight shifts in the resulting masses.

In Applegate et al. (2014), we quantify the systematic uncertainty associated with each of these components and show that the WTG data for 51 clusters determine the ensemble mean mass to a systematic precision of 7 per cent (8 per cent when statistical uncertainties are included).

Note that the X-ray-selection of the WtG clusters ensures that the comparison sample is fair (at least to the extent required here): selection by X-ray luminosity is largely insensitive to triaxiality and orientation along the line of sight (e.g. Allen et al. 2011). Instead, for X-ray selection, the dominant source of scatter is the existence/absence of a cool core. The WtG sample is thus unbiased in the sense that for a given 'true' cluster mass, it is equally likely to have selected a cluster that scatters 'up' or 'down' in weak-lensing mass.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Average mass calibration

In Fig. 1, we show the ratio $M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}}$ as a function of M_{Planck} . The *Planck* mass estimates are considerably lower than the weak-lensing based WtG masses, especially at large *Planck* masses. Using bootstrap realizations of the unweighted mean¹, we find the average mass ratio for the 22 clusters used in the *Planck* cluster cosmology analysis to be:

$$\beta_{\text{cos}} = \left\langle \frac{M_{\text{Planck}}}{M_{\text{WtG}}} \right\rangle = 0.688^{+0.056}_{-0.050} (\text{stat}) \pm 0.049 (\text{syst}) .$$

The systematic uncertainty quoted here expresses the systematic uncertainty on the weak-lensing masses, i.e. it includes all entries in Table 4 of Applegate et al. (2014) with the exception of the scatter due to triaxiality, which is accounted for here in the statistical uncertainty. Extending the sample to all 38 clusters yields a consistent result:

$$\beta_{\text{all}} = 0.698^{+0.039}_{-0.037} (\text{stat}) \pm 0.049 (\text{syst}) .$$

The weak-lensing masses are expected to yield the *true* cluster mass on average, and thereby enable a robust calibration of other




Figure 1. The ratio of cluster masses measured by *Planck* and by WtG, for the clusters common to both projects. Solid symbols denote clusters which were included in the *Planck* cluster cosmology analysis (22 clusters) and open symbols additional clusters in the *Planck* cluster catalog (16 clusters). The red, solid line indicates a ratio of unity (no bias). The dashed red line indicates $(1 - b) = 0.8$, the default value assumed throughout most of P16. The blue line and shaded regions show our best-fit mass ratio along with the 1- and 2- σ confidence intervals. Since the weak-lensing masses are expected to be unbiased *on average*, the ratio of *Planck* masses to weak-lensing masses is a measure of the bias $(1 - b) = M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{true}}$ of the *Planck* cluster masses as used in P20.




Figure 2. The direct comparison between M_{500} cluster masses measured by *Planck* and by WtG. The symbols are the same as in Fig. 1. The green line and shaded regions show the best-fit linear relation between the logarithmic masses and its 1- and 2- σ confidence intervals (the fit was performed with $\log(M_{\text{WtG}})$ as function of $\log(M_{\text{Planck}})$).

¹ We verified that this procedure returns unbiased estimators of the mean and standard deviation of a log-normal distribution, even in the presence of intrinsic scatter and if the measurement uncertainties correlate with the measured values (as can be seen in Fig. 1, less massive clusters have larger error bars and higher $M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}}$).

mass proxies (see discussion in von der Linden et al. 2014; Applegate et al. 2014). Therefore, by identifying $\beta = (1 - b)$, these results suggest that the mass calibration adopted by the Planck team, $(1 - b) \equiv 0.8$, underestimates the true cluster masses by between 5 and 25 per cent on average. Similarly, their alternative analysis, which marginalizes over $0.7 < (1 - b) < 1.0$ is significantly skewed from the range preferred by our weak-lensing calibration.

3.2 Evidence for a mass-dependent calibration problem

By eye, Fig. 1 suggests that the ratio between the WtG weak-lensing and *Planck* mass estimates depends on the cluster mass: at masses $\lesssim 6 \times 10^{14} M_{\odot}$, the mass estimates roughly agree, whereas the discrepancy appears significant for more massive clusters. To quantify the evidence for such a mass-dependent bias, we use the Bayesian linear regression method developed by Kelly (2007) to fit $\log(M_{\text{WtG}})$ as function of $\log(M_{\text{Planck}})$. Fitting the masses directly avoids the correlated errors in the mass ratios one would have to account for if fitting the data as shown in Fig. 1. While we show M_{Planck} as function of M_{WtG} in Fig. 2 to reflect that the weak-lensing masses are our proxy for true cluster masses, we assign the *Planck* mass estimates to be the independent variable of the fit to reduce the effects of Malmquist bias: M_{Planck} scales with the survey observable, and by choosing it as the independent variable, we provide a mass estimate for each data point which is to first order independent of other selection effects (as X-ray selection to first order does not correlate with SZ selection biases, and the lensing data are a subsample of an X-ray selected catalog). The Kelly (2007) method accounts for measurement errors in both variables, as well as for intrinsic scatter in the dependent variable. Rephrasing the results as a power-law, the best-fit relation for the 22 clusters in the cosmology sample is:

$$\left(\frac{M_{\text{Planck}}}{10^{15} M_{\odot}} \right) = (0.697^{+0.077}_{-0.095}) \times \left(\frac{M_{\text{WtG}}}{10^{15} M_{\odot}} \right)^{0.76^{+0.39}_{-0.20}},$$

where the systematic uncertainty on the weak-lensing mass calibration is accounted for in the uncertainty on the coefficient. In 24 per cent of the Monte Carlo samples, the slope (of $\log(M_{\text{Planck}})$ vs. $\log(M_{\text{WtG}})$) is unity or larger; i.e. the evidence for a mass-dependent bias is at the $\sim 1\sigma$ level for these 22 clusters.

To further test for a mass-dependent bias, it is instructive to include the additional 16 clusters in common between *Planck* and WtG that are not used in the *Planck* cluster cosmology analysis, as these extend the mass range probed. For all 38 clusters, we find a consistent and more precise result:

$$\left(\frac{M_{\text{Planck}}}{10^{15} M_{\odot}} \right) = (0.699^{+0.059}_{-0.060}) \times \left(\frac{M_{\text{WtG}}}{10^{15} M_{\odot}} \right)^{0.68^{+0.15}_{-0.11}}.$$

In 4.9 per cent of the Monte Carlo samples, the slope is unity or larger; i.e. the confidence level for a slope less than unity is 95 per cent².

² We note that when using bootstrap realizations of an unweighted simple linear regression as a more agnostic fit statistic, we recover the same slope, but with smaller uncertainties ($0.69^{+0.11}_{-0.08}$). In only 1.7 per cent of the bootstrap samples is the slope larger than unity. However, we choose to quote the more conservative error estimates returned by the Kelly (2007) method.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Implications for cosmological constraints

Comparing *Planck* cluster mass estimates (calibrated with hydrostatic mass estimates from *XMM-Newton* data) with weak-lensing-based mass measurements from the *Weighing the Giants* project, we have measured the bias of the *Planck* masses to be $\beta_{\text{cos}} = \langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{true}} \rangle = (1 - b) = 0.688 \pm 0.072$ for 22 clusters in the *Planck* cosmology sample ($\beta_{\text{all}} = 0.698 \pm 0.062$ for all 38 clusters in common between the two studies). This result assumes that the WtG mass measurements are unbiased to the level of accuracy discussed in Applegate et al. (2014). Our result suggests that the default mass calibration adopted by the Planck team, $(1 - b) = 0.8$, underestimates the true masses of Planck clusters by 5–25 per cent on average. More than half of the probability distribution we find for $\beta = (1 - b)$ is outside of the range of 0.7–1.0 that the *Planck* team marginalize over in their most conservative analysis.

A significantly lower value for the mass bias would reduce the tension between their SZ cluster count and CMB analyses (P20, also see Rozo et al. 2014c,b,a). Adopting the WtG mass calibration, which includes a sizable range of lower values for the mass bias would therefore reduce the tension and bring the constraints into significantly better agreement. In particular, it would remove the need to evoke unusually large neutrino masses in the context of a purely cosmological explanation of the claimed tension.

4.2 On the origin of the mass bias

The mass estimates used by the *Planck* team are based on hydrostatic modeling of *XMM-Newton* X-ray data for 20 relatively relaxed clusters (Arnaud et al. 2010). The mass bias term, $1 - b$, is primarily intended to account for departures from hydrostatic equilibrium (the ‘hydrostatic bias’). In practice, the bias term must account for the total, summed systematic offset between the mass estimates and true masses. Here the relevant terms include not just the hydrostatic bias, but also the effects of, e.g., instrument calibration, non-thermal pressure support, and temperature inhomogeneities.

Hydrostatic biases at the 10–20 per cent level at r_{500} (in the sense that X-ray measurements underestimate the true mass) are expected to exist even in relatively relaxed, massive clusters (e.g. Nagai et al. 2007; Rasia et al. 2012). This expectation is reflected in the choice of $(1 - b) = 0.8$ (or $0.7 < (1 - b) < 1.0$) by the *Planck* team. On the calibration side, cluster temperature (and therefore mass, $M \propto T^{3/2}$) estimates from *XMM-Newton* are typically lower than *Chandra*-based values for massive clusters: whereas *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* cluster temperature measurements agree well for relatively low-mass systems (with temperatures $kT < 2$ keV), for massive clusters ($kT \geq 5$ keV) typical of systems found in the *Planck* SZ survey, *XMM*-based temperature estimates tend to be about 20 per cent lower than *Chandra* values (Grant et al. 2013; Mahdavi et al. 2013; Schellenberger et al. 2014). This implies that an *XMM*-based M_{500} mass estimate for a ~ 6 keV cluster will be ~ 30 per cent lower than the corresponding *Chandra* value. The temperature-dependent discrepancy between the two cautions that mass proxies which incorporate X-ray temperature measurements require careful mass-/temperature-dependent calibration efforts. In this context, the trend in the ratio of *Planck* and WtG masses, implying larger bias at higher masses, is interesting. In combination, the effects of hydrostatic masses biases and temperature-dependent systematic offsets can easily reach 30 per cent, and provide a natural explanation for both the value of $\beta = (1 - b) = M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}}$ we observe, and the mass-dependent slope in the logarithmic ratio.

We deem it unlikely that the WtG weak-lensing measurements have a significant mass-dependent bias. Simulations indicate that weak-lensing mass estimates derived by fitting an NFW profile over the radial range used in the WtG study (which does not exceed the cluster virial radii nor extend too close to the cluster centers) should be nearly unbiased for systems in the mass range probed here (Oguri & Hamana 2011; Becker & Kravtsov 2011; Bahé et al. 2012). Any remaining biases affecting the WtG masses should be at most of the order of a few per cent. We note also that by comparing Planck Y_{500} estimates with independent weak-lensing mass estimates for five clusters, Gruen et al. (2013) report a mass dependence of the mass ratio in the same sense as we find.

Our results highlight the need for robust weak-lensing measurements to complement X-ray and SZ data in determining mass estimates for galaxy clusters. Whereas X-ray measurements can provide precise, *low-scatter* mass proxies for clusters, exhibiting minimal (<10–15 per cent) intrinsic scatter with respect to true mass (e.g. Allen et al. 2004, 2008; Kravtsov et al. 2006), weak-lensing data can provide an accurate *absolute* mass calibration of these proxies. In this way, through the combination of multi-wavelength data, the dominant systematic uncertainty currently affecting cluster cosmology can be largely circumvented.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In light of the reported tension between the cosmological constraints inferred from *Planck* SZ cluster counts and *Planck* CMB temperature anisotropies, we have compared the *Planck* team's cluster mass estimates with weak-lensing-based mass measurements determined by the *Weighing the Giants* project. For the 22 clusters in common between the *Planck* cluster sample and WtG that are used in the *Planck* cluster cosmology analysis, we find the average mass ratio to be $\langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}} \rangle = (1 - b) = 0.688 \pm 0.072$. For all 38 clusters in common between the two studies, we find $\langle M_{\text{Planck}}/M_{\text{WtG}} \rangle = 0.698 \pm 0.062$. These values are $\sim 1.6\sigma$ below the default bias adopted by P20, $(1 - b) = 0.8$. Also the range over which they marginalize for their more conservative analysis (0.7–1.0) is significantly skewed compared to the WtG mass calibration – half of the WtG range is not included. Adopting the WtG mass calibration would raise the value of σ_8 inferred from the *Planck* SZ cluster counts and alleviate the tension with the *Planck* CMB results.

We find modest (95 per cent) evidence for a mass-dependence of the mass calibration, with a best-fit power-law of $M_{\text{Planck}} \propto M_{\text{WtG}}^{0.68^{+0.15}_{-0.11}}$. As a possible origin for such a mass dependence we identify the temperature-dependent calibration uncertainty of the X-ray hydrostatic measurements used to calibrate the *Planck* cluster mass estimates.

Weak-lensing measurements provide an excellent complement to X-ray and SZ data in enabling the robust calibration of cluster masses. In forthcoming work (Mantz et al., in prep.), we will present cosmological constraints utilizing the full WtG sample in conjunction with X-ray selected cluster catalogs and extensive Chandra follow-up data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the referee for helpful suggestions to clarify the paper. Based in part on data collected at Subaru Telescope (University of Tokyo) and obtained from the SMOKA, which

is operated by the Astronomy Data Center, National Astronomical Observatory of Japan. Based on observations obtained with MegaPrime/MegaCam, a joint project of CFHT and CEA/DAPNIA, at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) which is operated by the National Research Council (NRC) of Canada, the Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique of France, and the University of Hawaii. This research has made use of the SZ-Cluster Database operated by the Integrated Data and Operation Center (IDOC) at the Institut d'Astrophysique Spatiale (IAS) under contract with CNES and CNRS.

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants AST-0838187 and AST-1140019, the U.S. Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC02-76SF00515, the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi) under project 50 OR 1210, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) through Chandra Award Numbers GO8-9118X and TM1-12010X (issued by the Chandra X-ray Observatory Center, which is operated by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for and on behalf of NASA under contract NAS8-03060) and program HST-AR-12654.01-A, provided by NASA through a grant from the Space Telescope Science Institute (operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA contract NAS 5-26555). The Dark Cosmology Centre (DARK) is funded by the Danish National Research Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. W., Evrard, A. E., & Mantz, A. B. 2011, *ARA&A*, 49, 409
- Allen, S. W., Rapetti, D. A., Schmidt, R. W., Ebeling, H., Morris, R. G., & Fabian, A. C. 2008, *MNRAS*, 383, 879
- Allen, S. W., Schmidt, R. W., Ebeling, H., Fabian, A. C., & van Speybroeck, L. 2004, *MNRAS*, 353, 457
- Anderson, L., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 427, 3435
- Applegate, D. E., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 48
- Arnaud, M., Pratt, G. W., Piffaretti, R., Böhringer, H., Croston, J. H., & Pointecouteau, E. 2010, *A&A*, 517, A92
- Bahé, Y. M., McCarthy, I. G., & King, L. J. 2012, *MNRAS*, 421, 1073
- Becker, M. R. & Kravtsov, A. V. 2011, *ApJ*, 740, 25
- Bennett, C. L., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 208, 20
- Benson, B. A., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 763, 147
- Beutler, F., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 3017
- Das, S., et al. 2014, *JCAP*, 4, 14
- Giocoli, C., Meneghetti, M., Metcalf, R. B., Ettori, S., & Moscardini, L. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 1899
- Grant, C. E., Guainazzi, M., Natalucci, L., Nevalainen, J., Plucinsky, P. P., Pollock, A., & Sembay, S. 2013, *arXiv:1305.4480*
- Gruen, D., et al. 2013, *arXiv:1310.6744*
- Heymans, C., et al. 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, 1323
- Hoekstra, H. 2007, *MNRAS*, 379, 317
- Kelly, B. C. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1489
- Kelly, P. L., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 28
- Kravtsov, A. V., Vikhlinin, A., & Nagai, D. 2006, *ApJ*, 650, 128
- LSST Dark Energy Science Collaboration. 2012, *arXiv:1211.0310*
- Mahdavi, A., Hoekstra, H., Babul, A., Bildfell, C., Jeltama, T., & Henry, J. P. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 116

- Mantz, A., Allen, S. W., Rapetti, D., & Ebeling, H. 2010a, MNRAS, 406, 1759
- Mantz, A., Allen, S. W., & Rapetti, D. 2010b, MNRAS, 406, 1805
- Massey, R., et al. 2007, MNRAS, 376, 13
- Nagai, D., Vikhlinin, A., & Kravtsov, A. V. 2007, ApJ, 655, 98
- Oguri, M. & Hamana, T. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 1851
- Okabe, N., Takada, M., Umetsu, K., Futamase, T., & Smith, G. P. 2010, PASJ, 62, 811
- Padmanabhan, N., Xu, X., Eisenstein, D. J., Scalzo, R., Cuesta, A. J., Mehta, K. T., & Kazin, E. 2012, MNRAS, 427, 2132
- Planck Collaboration. 2013a, arXiv:1303.5076
- Planck Collaboration. 2013b, arXiv:1303.5080
- Planck Collaboration. 2013c, arXiv:1303.5089
- Rasia, E., et al. 2012, New Journal of Physics, 14, 055018
- Reichardt, C. L., et al. 2012, ApJ, 755, 70
- Reid, B. A., Verde, L., Jimenez, R., & Mena, O. 2010, JCAP, 1, 3
- Rozo, E., Bartlett, J. G., Evrard, A. E., & Rykoff, E. S. 2014a, MNRAS, 438, 78
- Rozo, E., Evrard, A. E., Rykoff, E. S., & Bartlett, J. G. 2014b, MNRAS, 438, 62
- Rozo, E., Rykoff, E. S., Bartlett, J. G., & Evrard, A. 2014c, MNRAS, 438, 49
- Rozo, E., et al. 2010, ApJ, 708, 645
- Schellenberger, G., Reiprich, T. H., Lovisari, L., Nevalainen, J., & David, L. 2014, ArXiv e-prints
- Sehgal, N., et al. 2011, ApJ, 732, 44
- Truemper, J. 1993, Science, 260, 1769
- Vikhlinin, A., et al. 2009, ApJ, 692, 1060
- von der Linden, A., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 439, 2